

**REMARKS**

The drawings have been revised to conform with § 608.02. Withdrawal of the objection and approval of the drawing is requested.

The claims are amended formally in view of the Examiner's remarks. Withdrawal of the objection is requested.

Claims 1-4 were rejected under § 102 over Krieger (US 6,799,933). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Krieger is concerned with coupling the battery to the lid via contacts (claim 1, last paragraph; abstract; column 1, line 50 to column 2, line 3). Krieger is not concerned with the cable booster clamps 202a, 202b and it does not discuss them all, except to say that they are “mechanically secured to the holder 208 ... by grips 206a1 and 206a2 as shown ” (column 5, lines 18-21). Only what is directly illustrated in Figure 2 is applicable against the claims.

Krieger's Figure 2 fails to show several aspects of the Applicant's claim 1:

- (1) *A receptacle... body with only one open entrance end ... and a closed stopping end opposite to the open entrance end ...*

Krieger's holder 208 is basically a flat area with (apparently) five raised areas: a raised insulating barrier between the teeth of the two clamps to prevent a short circuit (asserted to anticipate the claimed stopping end), and the four grips. There is no “receptacle” (implying a concave or cup-shape) and no “one open entrance end.” Because there is no entrance end, and there is no stopping end opposite (the raised barrier is opposite to open space, not any “entrance”).

- (2) *the interior shape of which matches with the exterior shape of a clamp sheath ...*

This feature is not even hinted at by Krieger. The clamps appear to lie on a flat surface of holder 208. There is no “interior shape” because a flat surface had no “interior.”

- (3) *wherein a radially and inwardly protruded protrusion is provided on opposite sides of the upper portion of said open entrance end respectively, and said protrusions match with the recesses formed on the outer side surface of a handgrip portion of the clamp ...*

The only elements of Krieger that might conceivably correspond to the Applicant's claimed protrusion are Krieger's grips 206a1, 206a2. There is nothing that these can be "on opposite sides of" because they are both on the *same* side of the flat area of the holder 208, and a flat area has only *one* side and lacks "opposite" sides.

With respect, the Examiner's annotated Fig. 2 incorrectly identifies the protrusion as corresponding to the outer oval. The drawing does not show that this outer oval is anything other than a decoration, fillet, rabbet, etc., that lies entirely within a plane.

The Examiner is invited to note that, while Fig. 2 is an elevation, the clamps are shown in a slightly tilted configuration, such that the upper sides of the parts are visible. Within the outer angles formed by the handles' interiors, the upper edge of each lower handle is drawn with closely-spaced lines (seeming to show an interior channel of the handle) while the lower edge of the upper handle is drawn with just one line. On the top of each clamp, the upper edges of the upper handles are drawn with closely-spaced lines, which shows an upper surface of the clamp.

Considering that the upper surface of the clamps is shown without interruption, it is clear that Fig. 2 does not show that any portion of the outer oval in contact with that upper surface. Any protrusion perpendicular to the plane of the paper, that matched the shape of the grip, would be visible in Fig. 2, but there is none.

- (4) *... wherein at least one of two other opposite sides of the upper open entrance end of the body comprises a recess portion.*

With respect, no recess portion is disclosed. The oval line in Fig. 2 grazing the top and bottom of the apparent raised central barrier is ambiguous. While the oval line is double on the bottom but not on the top, it does not appear to the Applicant that the entire holder 208 is tilted because the central barrier and the rest of the holder 208 appear to be seen straight on, with no difference

between upper and lower edges. The Applicant believes that only the clamps, and not the holder, are shown in a tilted orientation.

As discussed above, the holder 208 has only one side, so that the "two other opposite sides" that are claimed are not disclosed.

Furthermore (in regard to dependent claim 3), if there were any recess portion on the flat area 208 like that of the Applicant's claim 3, it would be hidden behind the clamp and therefore it cannot be, and is not, shown, so that there is no anticipation.


Claims 5-7 were rejected under § 103 over Krieger (US 6,799,933). This rejection is respectfully traversed on the grounds set out above.

Claim 7 is amended in view of the Examiner's suggestion on page 6 of the Action, and is believed to be allowable. The Examiner is thanked for this suggestion, and also for the annotated drawing that made clear to the Applicant the Examiner's exact meaning.

Allowance is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

October 11, 2005  
Date

  
Nick Bromer (Reg. No. 33,478)  
**(717) 426-1664**  
RABIN & BERDO, P.C.  
CUSTOMER NO. 23995  
Telephone: (202) 371-8976  
Telefax : (202) 408-0924